



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,396	03/01/2004	Shumin Yang	IM-1-C1-PUS-1	3337

26949 7590 06/18/2004

HESKA CORPORATION  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT.  
1613 PROSPECT PARKWAY  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80525

EXAMINER

OUSPENSKI, ILIA I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1644

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/790,396	<b>Applicant(s)</b> YANG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ILIA OUSPENSKI	<b>Art Unit</b> 1644	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 40 - 59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 40 - 59 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant's Preliminary Amendment, filed 03/01/2004, is acknowledged and has been entered.

Claims 1 – 39 have been cancelled.

Claims 40 – 59 have been added.

*Claims 40 - 59 are pending and being acted upon presently*

### ***Sequence Compliance***

2. The instant application appears to be in sequence compliance for patent applications containing nucleotide sequence and/or amino acid sequence disclosures.

### ***Restriction Requirement***

3. The following is noted: Claim 53, and dependent claims thereof, include a recitation of "method to regulate an immune response". Specification discloses use of B7 proteins to "upregulate or downregulate" an immune response (e.g. page 46 first paragraph). These methods are mutually exclusive in that they reach opposing endpoints, and in that they employ structurally distinct forms of B7-2 protein to accomplish these mutually exclusive endpoints.

Consequently, the claims have been limited to either a method relating to downregulation, or a method relating to upregulation, irrespective of the format of the claims.

Art Unit: 1644

4. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

Group I. Claims 40 – 52, drawn to canine B7-2 proteins and compositions thereof, classified in class 530, subclass 350, and class 514, subclass 8.

Group II. Claims 40 – 52, drawn to feline B7-2 proteins and compositions thereof, classified in class 530, subclass 350, and class 514, subclass 8.

Group III. Claims 53 – 59, drawn to methods of upregulating an immune response comprising administering canine B7-2 protein, classified in class 514, subclass 8.

Group IV. Claims 53 – 59, drawn to methods of downregulating an immune response comprising administering canine B7-2 protein, classified in class 514, subclass 8.

Group V. Claims 53 – 59, drawn to methods of upregulating an immune response comprising administering feline B7-2 protein, classified in class 514, subclass 8.

Group VI. Claims 53 – 59, drawn to methods of downregulating an immune response comprising administering feline B7-2 protein, classified in class 514, subclass 8.

5. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions in Groups I and II are different products, which differ with respect to their physicochemical properties and are therefore patentably distinct.

Inventions in Groups I – II and groups VI-VIII are related as product and processes of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)).

In the instant case, the product as claimed, namely the B7-2 protein, can be used in a materially different process of using that product, such as the process of using the polypeptide as an immunogen to produce a reagent antibody that binds specifically to the polypeptide.

Inventions III, IV, V, and VI are disclosed as materially different methods that differ at least in objectives, method steps, reagents and/or doses and/or schedules used, response variables, assays for end products and/or results, and criteria for success and therefore, the claimed methods are distinct.

6. These inventions are distinct for the reasons given above. In addition, they have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by recognized divergent subject matter. Further, even though the classification is shared, a different field of search would be required to address the inhibitory versus stimulatory readouts. Moreover, a prior art search also requires a literature search, which would not be completely co-extensive. It is an undue burden for the examiner to search more than one invention. Therefore restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

7. It is noted that the specification discusses regulating an immune response to prevent or treat a number of diseases (page 40 paragraph 4). Thus this application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed Inventions III – IV: wherein the immune disorder is: autoimmune diseases, allergic reactions, infectious diseases, tumor development and graft rejection.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 53 – 59 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. M.P.E.P. § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of the other invention.

8. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed.

Art Unit: 1644

9. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

10. The examiner has required restriction between product (Groups I and II) and process claims (Groups III – VI). If applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

Art Unit: 1644

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ILIA OUSPENSKI whose telephone number is 571-272-2920. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 571-272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.



Art Unit: 1644

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ILIA OUSPENSKI

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1644

June 15, 2004

*Phillip Gambel*

PHILLIP GAMBEL, PH.D

PRIMARY EXAMINER

*TECH CENTER 1600*

*6/16/04*